



Docket: T2861-907039

#4 Election  
DSmall/Logan  
4-11-02

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Gunter BAÜER

Serial No.: 09/832,108 ✓

Filed: April 11, 2001

For: Electrical Connection Arrangement  
And Method for the Manufacture Thereof

Examiner: James R. HARVEY

Group Art Unit: 2800

McLean, Virginia  
April 8, 2002

RECEIVED  
APR - 9 2002  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Honorable Commissioner of Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

This paper is filed in response to the restriction requirement contained in the Official Action dated March 12, 2002, directed to the above-identified application.

The claims have been placed into two groups, with Group I including Claim 12, a process claim, and with Group II including Claims 1-11, directed to an electrical connector. Applicant hereby elects Claims 1-11 for the purposes of initial prosecution. The election is made with traverse, for the reasons set forth in detail below.

It is asserted, in making the restriction requirement, that restriction is proper, in that the claimed product, an electrical connector, can be made by a materially different process than that claimed. It is stated that the connector can be made, "by arranging the electrical connection into machined nesting grooves of multi-

piece plastic insert that can be snapped together to form a multiple shaped configurations instead of arranging the electrical connection in a basin and filling the basin with a molding mass". (emphasis added)

The underlined portion above is essentially the process as claimed in Claim 12. The connector itself, as presented in Claim 1, for example, requires that the connector have a connection portion and a connection zone, and that a wall be provided in the vicinity of the connection portion and connection zone, "such that a basin is formed and molding mass is distributed in said basin." This language closely tracks the process limitations in Claim 12

The product claims require a basin to be formed and that the basin have a molding mass distributed therein. As such, the alleged "materially different process" would not appear to produce a connector of the type set forth in Claim 1. If the alleged "materially different process" is considered to produce a connector as set forth in Claim 1, then Applicant would regard that process as falling within the scope of Claim 12, and thus the process would not be materially different.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested.

Early and favorable action on the merits of all of Claims 1-12 presented herein is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully,

MILES & STOCKBRIDGE P.C.

By: 

John C. Kerins  
Reg. No. 32,421

1751 Pinnacle Drive, Suite 500  
McLean, Virginia 22102-3833  
Telephone: (703) 610-8649  
#9165078v1